

CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

VOL. 1.

"YE SHALL KNOW THE TRUTH, AND THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."—JESUS CHRIST.

NO. 46.

[\$1 50 in advance.]

PROVIDENCE, R. I. SATURDAY, JUNE 18, 1825.

[\$2 at the end of the year.]

CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY,

By BARZILLAI CRANSTON,

At No. 8, North Main-Street (3d story) near the
Market-House.

Rev. DAVID PICKERING, Editor.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

To Rev. Moses Stuart, Andover, Mass.

DEAR SIR,

It is with the utmost reluctance that I am induced by existing circumstances to write to you, for the third time, and perhaps this may be the last on this particular point, unless you should "arouse and exalt your genius," and have the goodness to resume this all-important subject. Whenever you do, sooner or later, prompt attention will be paid to your labours, if practicable and expedient. As sufficient time has elapsed since my last, to enable you to reply, it is now thought highly necessary to make some general remarks, keeping your *mysterious* conduct in view as to your utter *silence* about a matter of such vast consequence to the whole human race; and apply your case as a fair specimen of the conduct of the orthodox party, in its nature, bearing some resemblance to this, and consider whether such treatment towards those who may differ from you is commendable, charitable, honorable, christian-like, or to use the words of our DIVINE MASTER, "is it doing unto others as *ye* would they should do unto you?" Your own conscience may answer—but others have no criterion to judge by in this case, except, "by their fruits *ye* shall know them,"—and we may further ask, in scripture language, "what do *ye* more than others?"

I have no disposition, and wish this idea to be kept in view throughout, to criminate, reject, slander, or despise any sect of christians, or detract in the least from their goodness or piety because they purely differ from me in sentiment. This is not the point in dispute. If you are *right* and I am *wrong*, why then cannot you be so ingenuous and complaisant, as to make one *effort*, to lead me in the way I *should go*? I have only called upon you to explain *your own writings* more fully, and have wished to be informed by yourself, whether you could evade proving universal salvation from your comments in question; but you have not, as yet, made any reply to my humble and sincere request. This conduct, dear sir, is mysterious to many, and can you say, that it is not full as inexplicable and mysterious to yourself as the doctrine of the *trinity* is said to be? I have heard the argument enforced by the trinitarians, that *this article* of faith ought to be believed whether it can be explained or understood fully or not—so I say relative to your conduct in not complying with my request, that it is very *mysterious* and *unaccountable*! Here is the mystery, and I do not know whether

you ever will unfold its hidden parts or explain its abstruseness. I blend your *conduct*, for the want of a better comparison, with the doctrine of the *trinity*, because both are mysterious. In this respect they are similar. In regard to the truth of the *trinity*, I never saw it explained, by any one, so as to convince me at all of its being a scripture doctrine. As it regards your conduct, I cannot conjecture nor will even surmise whether it will ever be explained: futurity only will determine.

In relation to the conduct of any class of christians, I do not wish to favour one denomination more than another, no further than any one supports principles which appear most consonant to *truth* and comporting with the word of God. That is, never condemn any class of people or any individual, merely because their creed does not exactly coincide with mine. Therefore, when I consider your highly devoted character, your superior talents, and great literary advantages with which you are surrounded; I say when I consider all these things, your conduct does, in regard to my request, to be plain and honest about the matter, stands *unparalleled*. In the course of my own observation, reading and hearing, I never knew the *equal* before—and does it not too much resemble the conduct of your party in general. Is it not true, I would ask you, that many simple, insignificant and ridiculous stories have been published to the world, and the publishers or the authors of the stories have been called upon to give substantial *proof* of the facts connected with such statements—and what, my dear sir, do these idle and whimsical accounts turn out to be? Why, generally, not having *sufficient proof* for their round assertions; then, the subject is treated on their part with *silence* and with contempt towards those who call the *truth* of the matter in question. Many instances have occurred since my day and some have lately been *palmed* upon the publick which have proved no better than falsehoods.

I have not made the above statements with a view of *charging* them to you; no indeed, I make them to let you know that your party of *popular* christians are addicted to the shelter of *silence* when called upon to prove their *marvellous* and ill-timed publications. What a shameful piece of conduct it is to criminate and slander any sect of christians by publishing false and exaggerated pieces, and after the publication to shrink from an examination "because their deeds are evil." I do not say that you justify this procedure in the conduct of your party; but only take yours for a *specimen*. If I knew or thought that the Universalists published pieces of such a slanderous character, without good proof of their correctness, as I have seen published by the Calvinists, I should abhor and discountenance it at once. But I have never seen any thing of the kind, and have endeavoured to inform myself in every way, and hope that our cause and *truth* can be supported without resorting to the

method of fabricating accounts from prejudice, superstition, bigotry and ignorance. Truth is to be supported instead of falsehood—The bible instead of human creeds—A fair, plain, honest and manly defence of our sentiments, rather than resort to evasion, sophistry, or *silence*.

One thing more, sir, I wish to remind you of which the Calvinists say much about, i. e. they say that the Universalists and also the Unitarians *never*, or seldom do, *experience* religion of the heart, they are guilty of sophistry and quibbling in illustrating the scriptures; and also it is sometimes stated, and a poor excuse is better than none, that those who vindicate these *heretical* doctrines, are *rather weak minded*, led away by the fancy and imagination, and become biassed in favor of *those doctrines*, in opposition to real orthodoxy, without much reflection, meditation, or investigation. Such cants, oblique inuendoes, and evil suggestions as these, may do very well to feed a *hungry* fanatic; but will never serve to convince people of the great truths of the *everlasting gospel*! however weak and imbecile in intellect, or being led away by fancy and imagination, or biassed in favor of a doctrine without much due reflection, &c. &c. Now allowing all these things to be true, then on the other hand, it is inexpressibly strange and *mysterious* that *those* who have made such great proficiency in literary attainments, who consider themselves as the only true ambassadors of heaven, and the only true messengers of God, cannot exhibit something that looks *more consistent and truly scriptural* in maintaining any system of doctrine, and offer arguments of *some weight* in overthrowing *heresy*, which the orthodox say "*prevails to such an alarming degree*." Low cunning and loud fulminations do but little in getting people to heaven, or enlightening their minds.

As to the *truth* of regeneration as *explained* and *supported* by the orthodox, who generally hold themselves to be the peculiar favorites of *God's grace*, I do very much doubt, and consider the believers of *Calvinism* as strangers to such a *supernatural* change as they attempt to exhibit to those whom they consider in a state of *moral darkness*! How can a Calvinist tell whether a person's heart has undergone a moral change? Shall he be condemned only because he differs from you, in sentiment, and because his mind is not so moulded as to interpret the scriptures just like yourself? For it is as probable for the judgment to be as biassed, the passions to be as corrupt, the fancy and imagination may take their flight and waft the minds of Calvinists to the pinnacle of *deception* and *delusion*, as well as it may or can the Universalists and Unitarians! We, who are called by your party, by harsh names, such as deists, infidels, deceivers, intriguers, and taking shelter *under a refuge of lies*, do find they are but mere assertions of *no force*. They are like "clouds and broken cisterns which can hold no water!"

Thus far, dear sir, have I gone in depicting very

imperfectly this topic. I have written much more than I originally calculated. Perhaps you will say, I have been rather harsh, illiberal, disguised the main subject, misrepresented and exaggerated many things, and have not discovered a christian spirit. You have no reason, I think, to complain, for I have called upon you, heretofore, with all the complaisance, the candor and fairness that was necessary, and no notice taken of me—your *silence* and *indifference* has been the cause of this letter. Therefore, I answer you in the words of Pilate, "*What I have written, I have written*."—I shall now close with a short paragraph from Dr. Griffin's "Address delivered before the American Education Society in Boston, May 23, 1825." This I do calculating to shew to your party from it, which is the most *unfair* in making our statements in detecting *error*. Let every one read the following as containing a good specimen of the *spirit* of orthodoxy, well tempered, pure evangelical doctrine; a change of heart, no doubt, in the author, touches the very *core of heresy*, and will modestly say, "*he handleth the matter wisely*" to his own shame. After you have read Dr. Griffin's ideas below, I hope you may have the candor and generosity to allow, that I have not followed his example in *warmth* of expression, nor departed so far from the *truth*!!

Dr. Griffin has the following,—"*What growl is that I hear from the distant hedges? Who is it that snarls and gnashes so furiously at the project of furnishing the world with ministers and sending them to the heathen? Is he a Universalist, who sincerely thinks he has bottomed his faith upon the bible? He would have you think this. But if he believed the bible he would not thus rave at seeing it carried to the heathen, even by those who differ from him in some respects. He would see it calculated to do the heathen infinite good, even if they should mistake the test of the promises. No, he is an infidel, and fights under false colours. With all his fears and tremblings about christian hypocrisy and the deceptions of priestcraft, he is himself a hypocrite, a deceiver, and knows himself to be such. With all his pity for our poverty of spirit, he is himself a coward, and dares not appear in his own proper character. He professes an attainment to a religion which he hates, only to destroy it, and Judas-like, betrays his Master with a kiss. Let those who rave and gnash their teeth at the education of ministers and at missions to the heathen, come out like men and write in broad and burnished characters upon their foreheads, INFIDEL,—THE DETERMINED ENEMY OF CHRIST,—RESOLVED NEVER TO REST TILL HE HAS DRIVEN THE HATED NAZARENE FROM THE EARTH.*" *Boston Rec. & Tel.*

I would just remind you and Dr. G's friends, before closing, that in the *very* next sentence to the above, the Dr. has *fully* advocated and *completely* stated his entire conviction, tho' I think unintentional on his part, of the *truth* of *Universalism*—the same identical doctrine he had just before vilified, degraded, and endeavoured to trample under his feet—he then after all this, *immediately* goes on and makes his remarks perfectly applicable to the sentiment. This is really astonishing and shows to demonstration what gross and palpable contradictions are made without *such* "knowing

what they say nor whereof they affirm."—"Yea, and why even of *yourselves* judge ye not what is right." With esteem and due respect, I remain your friend and humble servant.

R. C * * * *

Middleboro', June 9, 1825.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

REGENERATION.

MR. EDITOR—There is no article of faith more relied upon at the present day, and I think none more replete with inconsistencies, not to say absurdities, than that which is usually termed *Regeneration*.—This article rests upon the favourite doctrine of total depravity, from which it is said man must be changed by a *special* exercise of divine grace upon his heart to newness of life; or in other words, from depravity to holiness. Now, *granting* that the doctrine of total depravity be true, I should find no great difficulty in believing this article, were not the days of miracles passed by, and had our Lord ever performed one of as surprising a nature as this appears to be.—He, it is true, performed many wonderful acts, and worked many surprising miracles; but is there a single instance upon record of his performing one so wonderful as that of changing a person's heart, feelings and affections, from a totally depraved state, to either total or partial holiness? This act is not a mere renewal of a principle which before existed in the heart, but it is the production of an entirely new principle: We have no evidence of Christ's bringing any person to a belief in Christianity or to holiness, except by a faith produced in them, they believed from the evidence that was presented them, so it was not Christ that convicted them, but it was the evidences he produced; they *believed* what they *could not disbelieve*, without losing sight of the evidences of his truth. But in this case, faith is out of the question in toto; and indeed it is strenuously contended that a man can have no faith in Christianity until such times as his heart is changed; because being *totally* depraved, he cannot understand the nature of Christianity. "The natural man," say they, "cannot discern spiritual things for they are spiritually discerned." If man is really so depraved, this appears perfectly reasonable, but then it puts conversion or regeneration altogether out of man's power, and the act, if performed at all, must be the sole work of God upon his *passive* instrument, man. Why then is man called upon to be converted—or why does God work this change in the heart of one and not in another? I dare say some will pretend because he is *impartial*. But it appears really astonishing that the impartiality of God should appear in one instance in his being "*good unto all*," in his "*sending ruin upon the evil and upon the good*," and in another in bestowing the greatest blessing in his gift upon one depraved being and withholding it from ten or perhaps ten thousand others, and perhaps it may be, better men to society! For I believe it a fact beyond denial that the majority of those who are the subjects of such sudden conversions are not above the middling class of society in point of morality. But it is pretended that this is correct, for we read that "where sin abounded grace did much more abound." So then, this is the doctrine

that is calculated to improve society; this is the doctrine that checks licentiousness. Kind reader, do you not think by this time that it would be wise in our legislature to remove all penalties for crimes for the space of two or three years? I have not the least doubt but that rogues would increase very rapidly during the time, and these upon the law's being again put in force would furnish a fine number of candidates for office. Don't you think, kind reader, that the moment they received commissions from government they would become honest men—fit to be intrusted with the interests and lives of the community? Yet as *absurd* as this may appear, it is the popular doctrine of regeneration! Men are taught by it that the greater sinners they become, the greater will be their conversion, the greater their holiness when converted, and God's power and glory more visibly manifested in their conversion.

But, Mr. Editor, is there any thing of this doctrine in the Bible? Do Christ's words to Nicodemus, "Except ye be *born again* ye cannot see the kingdom of heaven," afford any proof of this doctrine?—Does it appear that Nicodemus was totally depraved—or, does it appear that he was called upon to change his nature from total depravity to holiness? Jesus, upon another occasion, set a little child in the midst and said, "verily I say unto you except ye be converted and become as little children ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven"—but did he intend by this that man must be changed to the state or nature of children? The advocates of this doctrine contend, and indeed it constitutes the foundation of their scheme, that children are totally depraved: And did he call upon men to become so? Here are two totally different examples, the one or other of which must be the fact: either that Christ called a holy being to change his nature to depravity, or a totally depraved one from depravity to holiness: for according to this article, there is no middle ground; a man is either holy or unholy, in grace or out of grace; (as it is termed,) there is no middle ground; he must be one or the other, and if changed, he must be changed from one to the other. So if applied to children, whether holy or unholy—if unholy this article cannot be true, for no one will pretend that men must be converted to depravity; and if holy it saps the very foundation of the idea, for it is built upon the notion of depravity; if this is taken away, it is not pretended to be true.

But in all my search I can find the word regeneration mentioned but twice in the Bible, the first in St. Matthew xix. 28. in which Christ tells his apostles that they which had followed him in the regeneration should, &c.—from which it plainly appears that whatever regeneration may be, it formed a part of Christ's ministry, as well as that of the apostles: Therefore, as we find no instance of their changing any person from total depravity to holiness, we have good reason to conclude that the idea is false. The word is again made use of in Titus iii. 5. in the following connexion. "But according to his [God's] mercy who saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." Saved from what—total depravity? Paul had just before stated that "*we*" (that is himself and Titus) "*Also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving diverse*

lusts, and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another. But after that the kingdom and love of God our Saviour towards men appeared. Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, &c." But not from total depravity. Paul here plainly depicts his own situation previous to his conversion to christianity; yet will any pretend that Paul was totally depraved before he embraced it? He himself declares that what he did, he did "ignorantly, verily believing he was doing God service." What, can a totally depraved being have any idea of right? can a man be thus depraved, and at the same time, strive to serve God? The fact appears to be this, Paul was saved from his erroneous impressions of God's character and purposes by a particular revelation from heaven, which persuaded him of the inconsistency of his conduct, not the total depravity of his nature; and this was done as a special act of grace, as a favour to him as an individual. But again, we are saved "by the renewing of the Holy Ghost," or spirit. This sets the matter at rest; for it appears they were before possessors of the Holy Spirit, and were saved from their sins and errors by a renewal of it in them. Where then is this total depravity? It has vanished—Where is this change from depravity to holiness? Alas! it has dwindled from the most wonderful miracle, to a mere renewing of love in the heart, of a man released from the bondage of error to the embrace of truth, and to correct views of God, and man's true character. This may be effected in all men, as well as in Paul, would they study God's character and purposes of grace, and it would lead them as it did him from the indulgence of evil passions and propensities, and from the exercise of that domineering and persecuting spirit, which a false view of God and his government imposes upon the human mind. How important then, that we attend to the study of nature and revelation; that we, like him, may be improved, and that we may be cleansed from the error of our ways by the "washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost" in our hearts. *I speak as unto wise men—judge ye what I say.*

LUCIUS.

SELECTIONS.

THE INSTRUCTION OF CHILDREN SHOULD BE BEGUN IN VERY EARLY AGE.

Very young children are capable of learning many things of incalculable importance to themselves. All parents appear to me to labour under serious mistakes with regard to the subject; and begin to teach their children, many things at least, at a later period, than that, in which they would advantageously begin to receive them. The infant mind opens faster than we are apt to be aware, and receives lasting impressions. The infant mind lays strong hold of every thing which it is taught. Both its understanding and affections are then occupied.—The affections are then remarkably susceptible, tender, and vigorous. Every person knows the peculiarly impressive effect of novelty. On the infant mind every thing is powerfully impressed because every thing is new. From these causes is derived that remarkable fact, so commonly observed, that early impressions influence the char-

acter and the life beyond all others; and remain strong and vivid, after most others are worn away.

From these remarks must be seen, with irresistible evidence, the immense importance of seizing this happy period, to make religious impressions on the minds of our offspring. He who loses this season, is like a husbandman who wastes the spring in idleness, and sows in midsummer. How can such a man rationally expect a crop. Among the facts and doctrines, suited to the early mind, none are imbibed with more readiness, or fastened upon with more strength, than the existence, presence, perfections, and providence of God: the creation of all things by his power; its own accountableness to him; and the immense importance of his favour, and therefore, of acting in such a manner as to obtain his approbation. These things, then, together with such as are inseparably connected with them, should without fail be always taught at the dawn of the understanding.

Dwight.

QUESTIONS.

1. If God created all men for happiness, what will prevent the completion of his design? as he possesses all wisdom, power and goodness, works all things after the counsel of his own will, and does whatever his soul desires.
2. If he created a part for misery, why does he pretend to offer them felicity? as the wisdom of Heaven is without partiality or hypocrisy, and as with God there is no respect of persons.
3. If he created all for heaven, but knows that only a part will enjoy it, why does he involve his conduct in inconsistency, by striving to save those from ruin, whom he knows he can never benefit?

EFFECTS OF CHURCH AND STATE.

The following, from the Liverpool Mercury, is an apt commentary and illustration of the benefits and blessings of a union of church and state. Let every American, while he reads it, thank God that he lives in a country where every religious denomination has an established church of equal influence and privileges. *Ad.*

Clerical Avarice.

We observe by the police reports of the metropolis, that the Rev. Dr. Wilson, rector of St. Mary's, Aldermanbury, sent his tithe-collector to apply to the lord mayor for a warrant of distress, against a poor widow, for a demand of 17. 8s. of tithe. The collector expressed his regret at being obliged to call on the widow, who was in the deepest poverty and distress. The circumstances of her case were such, that the lord mayor sent an urgent recommendation that the demand might not be pressed, and that he himself would rather compromise it, by paying the Rev. Dr. 10s. in the pound. But the Dr. would listen to no such recommendation; disapproved of his lordship meddling with his private affairs; and, although the church-wardens had declined demanding the poor rates from the poor woman, who was in a state of great wretchedness (and she was the only one of the doctor's parishioners who expressed inability to pay) he sent back the collector to apply for the distress warrant. The lord mayor, finding that

the divine was as resolute for his tithe as Shylock for his bond, paid the sum himself to save the poor creature from actual starvation and despair. The contrast in the humanities of the doctor and the worthy magistrate requires no comment. But let us hear no more of the Catholic's levying rent. They never levied any thing so atrociously oppressive as this.

FROM THE UNIVERSALIST MAGAZINE.

REMARKS ON JOB xxxv. 6, 7.

"If thou sinnest, what doest thou against him? or if thy transgressions be multiplied, what doest thou unto him? If thou be righteous, what givest thou to him? or what receiveth he of thine hand?"

We learn from the above quoted passage of scripture the following very important truth, viz. that the sins of mankind do not injure the Deity, and that the virtues of men are no benefit to him. This fact will be rendered more plain and undeniable by a consideration of particular sins, whereby it will be distinctly seen that they are injurious to man and man alone.—St. Paul has given us a long catalogue of crimes which he denominates the works of the flesh: they are as follows: "Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like." Now it requires but very little attention to see that all the injury we can discover in these sins must be suffered by man only. Look for instance, at the sin of idolatry. Behold the infatuated worshipper bowing down to the work of his own hands, and tormenting his body to appease the wrath of his incensed God. See him prostrate himself before the car of Juggernaut. See the mother cast her infant into the flames as a sacrifice to the idol she adores. Now inquire whether it is God or man who is injured by this practice.—Can the sin of witchcraft be injurious to the Deity? It is not supposable that the Deity is so blind as not to know this is all unreal. Those only who were so much deceived as to believe in the real existence of witches and ghosts were injured by the deceivers who pretended to practice witchcraft. But if we were to allow the reality of witchcraft, it would not be reasonable to suppose the Deity could be injured by it. For the Almighty, omniscient, omnipresent God controls all beings.—Paul comprehends in the works of the flesh, "hatred, variance, and wrath." The fact that they are works of the flesh shews that they must not be ascribed to the Deity as they are to man. Can he, then, be injured by them? Those who are hateful, wrathful, or dissentious must endure the consequences of these things. Can God be injured by sedition? This may injure men as great as kings, but it cannot injure Jehovah. Even in Milton's fanciful account of the sedition of the angels in heaven, the Deity is not represented as sustaining any injury thereby. "Murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like." Can the Deity be injured by these? It is impossible. There is need of no more illustration. Wickedness may hurt a man, and righteousness may profit the son of man, but God they can neither injure nor benefit.

Seeing then so plainly the important fact above stated and illustrated, we are led to inquire, *why God*

commands men not to sin. Some may not be able to see, if God be not injured by sin, why he should have commanded men not to be sinners. It may be said, God does this because he hates sin. But this answer serves only to elicit another question, viz. *Why does he hate sin?* The only rational answer which can be given must be predicated upon the love of God to mankind, and is this: God hates sin and commands men not to practice it, because it is injurious to them.—Those who have noticed with care the nature of God's commandments have seen that all he has commanded us to do is beneficial, while all he has commanded us not to do is injurious to us. We have seen that the works of the flesh, from the very nature of things, must be injurious to man, and these are the things which God has forbidden us to do. But on the other hand, how well calculated is all we are commanded to do, to increase the welfare and felicity of mankind. Suppose men universally were to act agreeably to the precepts of the gospel, and do unto others as they would that others should do unto them, what happy days should we have here on earth! What a vast change would the moral world experience!

I would now inquire whether the reader can see any reason why God should punish men endlessly, or why he should punish them at all for any other purpose than to promote their good thereby. Sin is no injury to God; righteousness is no benefit to him. The sinner, while he is such, not only loses the benefit which righteousness would afford him, if he were righteous, but necessarily suffers all the injury which is the consequence of his sins. Why then should the unfortunate creature be punished, except it be to effect his reformation? I ask those this question who believe that punishment is something superadded to the natural consequences of sin. Cast away *eternal* punishment out of sight. Man is as ungrateful as he is unreasonable to cherish a thought of its being true. Can the least reason be seen for punishing the sinner one moment, for any purpose beside his good? And if any other means would do better, there can no good reason be given why punishment should be adopted to effect reformation.

Many people have supposed that God punishes sin, simply because it is committed against him, or his laws. The reason God makes laws against sin is to promote the good of mankind. Will he then, because the sinner breaks these laws, cause him to suffer an absolute evil? The sinner loses in breaking the law, to say nothing more, that great reward which there is in keeping the commandments of God.

How powerful an incentive to virtue does the subject present to our minds! We see that we shall enjoy the full and sole benefit of all our virtues, and suffer all the consequences of our own sins. We see how injurious sin is to us, and learn therefrom why we are commanded to do good. Kind reader, let us heed the exhortation which saith unto us, "Let the wicked forsake his ways, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him: and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon."

RICHARDS.

HOUSE OF WORSHIP.

On Thursday, the 12th ultimo, the frame of the Universalist Meeting-house in Turner, was raised. The occasion is said to have been highly interesting and important. A general invitation having been given, to the people of Turner and Buckfield, several hundred men were present. As the concourse was made up of the different denominations in those towns, it was thought proper to invite the Rev. Mr. Greely of Turner, to address the throne of Grace by prayer; with which he cheerfully complied, and performed the service in a very appropriate, impressive and solemn manner. For this act of liberality and christian duty, Mr. Greely is entitled to that respect and veneration, which we cannot in conscience manifest towards Congregational clergymen, in general, in this State. Agreeably to the pious desires that were expressed in prayer, the frame was reared without accident or harm; and it has been remarked by *spectators*, that there was the most harmony and good will manifested, and less bad language and other abuses indulged, than they ever before witnessed, on an occasion of the kind. Let us all unite then, with our friends, in gratitude for past mercies, and in humble prayer that their benevolent efforts may be abundantly succeeded.

SATURDAY NIGHT.

Sweet to the soul the parting ray,
That ushers placid evening in;
When with the still expiring day,
The Sabbath's peaceful hours begin;
How grateful to the anxious breast,
The sacred hours of holy rest.

I love the blush of vernal bloom,
When morning gilds night's sullen tear,
And dear to me the mournful gloom
Of Autumn, "Sabbath of the year;"
But purer pleasures, joys sublime,
Await the dawn of HOLY TIME.

Hushed is the tumult of the day,
And worldly cares and business cease;
While soft the vesper breezes play,
To hymn the glad return of peace;
O season blest, O moments given!
To turn the vagrant thoughts to Heaven,

What though involved in lurid night,
The loveliest charms of nature fade!
Yet mid the gloom can heavenly light,
With joy, the contrite soul pervade;
O then Great Source of light divine,
With beams ethereal, gladden mine.

Oft as these hallowed hours shall come,
O raise my thoughts from earthly things,
And bear me to my heavenly home—
On living Faith's immortal wings—
'Till the last gleam of life decay
In one eternal SABBATH DAY!

CHARITY.

As the rivers which roll over the surface of the earth meet in the Ocean, so do all the virtues which embellish human life centre in Charity.

ANECDOTE.

Two persons met at the house of a Friend, and spent several long hours in telling over their conviction, conversion, religious discoveries and exploits; both of them frequently asserting their marvellous change from nature to grace. At length, having mostly exhausted their fund of intelligence, one of them began to sigh, and groan, and disfigure his face,—complaining bitterly about his hard and deceitful heart, which he said, was desperately wicked. The other, being more sincere, or supposing there was no necessity for such pious apologies at that time, expressed his serious doubts of the correctness of such language. But the Deacon would not give way in the least; he insisted that he was actually as bad as he had described himself to be. And just as the other professor was about to reason him out of his humiliating confession, the Quaker interrupted him—"Friend, thou wouldst do well, first to make thyself acquainted with this Deacon's character among his neighbours; by which thou wouldst be convinced, that he had at least once told thee *the truth*."

HAPPINESS.

Do you wish for happiness? Enjoy what you possess without consuming life with vain expectations; learn to be patient and set proper bounds to your desires. Without moderation nothing can be really enjoyed.

A witty moralist used to say of taverns, that they were places where men sold *madness* by the bottle.

Owing to the absence of the Editor, the conclusion of the Reply to "Orion" will be deferred until next week.

MARRIED,

In this town, on Tuesday evening last, by Rev. Mr. Wilson, Mr. Thomas Millet, to Mrs. Elizabeth Thurston.

On Monday last, by Rev. Mr. Ludlow, Mr. James E. Budlong, of this town, to Miss Abby Johnson, of Newport.

In Bristol, 7th inst. Rev. Charles Henry Alden, of this town, to Miss Alice B. Wight, daughter of Rev. Henry Wight, of the former place.

DIED,

In this town, on Monday morning last, Florette, daughter of Capt. Wm. P. Smith, aged 4 years.

On Wednesday evening last, Mr. Jason Sprague, in the 45th year of his age.

In Cambridge, Mass. on Tuesday morning last, after a short illness, Mrs. Mary Jackson Parsons, wife of Dr. Usher Parsons, of this town, and daughter of Rev. Dr. Holmes, aged 23.

On Staten Island, on Saturday last, Daniel D. Tompkins, Esq. aged 51, late Vice-President of the United States.

FANCY JOB PRINTING,

Neatly executed at this Office, at short notice, and on favourable terms.